

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/034,277	34,277 12/28/2001		Robert Paul Morris	2358P/P215 9757		
49278	7590	09/27/2006		EXAMINER		
SCENERA	RESEAF	RCH, LLC	CORRIELUS, JEAN M			
111 Corning	Road					
Suite 220			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Cary, NC 2	27511		2162			

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
		10/034,277	MORRIS ET AL.	MORRIS ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		Jean M. Corrielus	2162					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence addre	ess				
Period fo	· ·	/ 10 0FT TO EVDIDE 6 N	10NTU(0) OD TUUDTY (00)	D 4 \ / 0				
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNI 36(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON, cause the application to become Al	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this comm BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 Ju	<u>ıne 2006</u> .						
·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	action is non-final.						
3)[Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D). 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims							
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-4,7-19,22-34 and 36-43</u> is/are pend	ing in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		•					
6)⊠	Claim(s) 1-4, 7-19, 22-34 and 36-43 is/are reje	ected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.						
Applicati	ion Papers							
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.						
·	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		by the Examiner.					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyar	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	ion is required if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR	1.121(d).				
11)[The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached	d Office Action or form PTO-	-152.				
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. §	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		, , , ,					
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received in A	pplication No					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		received in this National Sta	age				
	application from the International Bureau	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,						
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not	received.					
Attachmen	t(s)							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)					
3) 🔲 Infor	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-15 	52)				

Art Unit: 2162

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response the Request for Continued Examination filed on June 7, 2006, in which claims 1-4, 7-19, 22-34 and 36-43 are presented for further examination.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 7, 2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 4. Claims 1-4, 7-19, 22-34 and 36-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed. In particular, the claimed feature of "providing form information to a client computer" is not described in the specification to enable one having ordinary skill in the art to make and use the invention. The specification paragraph [0024] defines a web server application, which

Art Unit: 2162

includes a form-driven user interface that provides clients with an easy and intuitive way to define custom metadata schema without specifying the syntax for knowing the underlying schema language. However, such abovementioned of the specification does not provide form information to a client computer. Based on the analysis provided above and substantial evidence or reasoning, the examiner provided that one having ordinary skilled in the art would not recognize in the disclosure a description of the invention defined by the claims. The limitation as claimed "providing form information to a client computer" is not supported by the as-filed disclosure, which is violated the written description requirement. In re Rasmussen, 650 F.2d 1212, 211 USPQ 323 (CCPA 1981). Applicant should duly note that the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 requires that the "specification shall contain a written description of the invention". Applicant should also note that the essential goal of the description of the invention requirement is to clearly convey the information that an applicant has invented the subject matter which is claimed; and to put the public in possession of what the applicant claims as the invention." Furthermore, the written description requirement of the Patent Act promotes the progress of the useful arts by ensuring that patentees adequately describe their inventions in their patent specifications in exchange for the right to exclude others from practicing the invention for the duration of the patent's term. Indeed, the specification doe not satisfy the written description requirement because the specification does not describe the claimed invention in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can reasonably conclude that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/034,277

Art Unit: 2162

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Page 4

6. Claims 1-4, 7-19, 22-34 and 36-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1, recites "providing form information to a client computer for presenting a form-driven user interface that allows the user to specify, without using syntax required by an underlying specification language, a plurality of properties, including constraints supported by the underlying specification, thereby define a custom metadata schema". Applicant should duly note that the step to achieve the defined custom metadata schema is given. However, such a customized metadata schemas is not yet defined. Applicant is advised to amend the claims to define such custom metadata schemas set forth in the claims.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean M. Corrielus whose telephone number is (571) 272-4032. The examiner can normally be reached on 10 hours shift.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/034,277

Art Unit: 2162

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 371-272-1000.

Jean Morrielus Primary Examiner Art Unit 2162

August 17, 2006